UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/647,777	12/29/2000	Hiroyuki Morimoto	02500.000006.	3913
	7590 09/17/200 CELLA HARPER &	EXAMINER		
1290 Avenue of		TRAN, SUSAN T		
NEW YORK, NY 10104-3800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1615	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/17/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/647,777	MORIMOTO ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		S. Tran	1615			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Poperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 M	av 2009				
-		action is non-final.				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
٥/١	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	ion of Claims	,				
·		d 00 102 is/are pending in the an	aliantian			
	Claim(s) <u>42,43,46,53,63,72,73,80,81,84,91 and 99-102</u> is/are pending in the application.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
·	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
	6) Claim(s) <u>42,43,46,53,63,72,73,80,81,84,91 and 99-102</u> is/are rejected.					
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)[_]	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Applicat	on Papers					
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.				
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce	epted or b) objected to by the B	Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some coll None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
2) Notice (3) Inform	t(s) te of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite			

Art Unit: 1615

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 42, 43, 46, 53, 63, 72, 73, 80, 81, 84, 91 and 99-102 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. It appears that the present specification does not provide support for the limitation "a coating film which enhances release in intestine or sustained release, and is destroyed when a molding material comprising said granule is compressed at tableting pressure greater than 1.3 ton/cm²". In the Remarks filed 10/24/06, applicant pointed out page 14, lines 5-9 and experiments 3-4 for support of the limitation "coating film is destroyed when a molding material comprising said granule is compressed at tableting pressure greater than 1.3 ton/cm²", however, upon reconsideration, it appears that the experiments do not support the above limitation. Specifically, Experiments 3 and 4 as pointed out by the applicant show that tablet compressed at pressure of 1000 kg/punch (less than 1.3 ton) lost sustained release function and enteric function respectively (see page 66, 4th paragraph through page 68, 1st paragraph).

Claims 42, 43, 46, 53, 63, 72, 73, 80, 81, 84, 91 and 99-102 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a method of producing a tablet, does not reasonably provide enablement for producing tablet having adequate hardness at tabletting pressure of 0.7-1.3 ton/cm². The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Page 3

Enablement is considered in view of the Wands factors (MPEP 2164.01 (a)). These include: 1) breadth of the claims; 2) nature of the invention; 3) state of the prior art; 4) amount of direction provided by the inventor; 5) the level of predictability in the art; 6) the existence of working examples; 7) quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure; and 8) relative skill in the art. All of the factors have been considered with regard to the claims, with the most relevant factors being discussed below:

Breadth of the claims is broad. Independent claims 42 and 63 require tablet having adequate hardness to withstand the tablet pressure of 0.7-1.3 ton/cm².

Amount of direction provided by the inventor, and quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention: while the present specification at page 24, second paragraph discloses the present tablet production method can produce a tablet having enough practical level hardness at tabletting pressure of less than or equal to 1 ton/cm², the specification fails to describe how to

precisely achieve the claimed tabletting pressure greater than 1 ton/cm² (up to 1.3 ton/cm².

Further, contrary to the claims, the working examples show that the properties of the tablet (e.g., sustained function and enteric function) are destroyed at tabletting pressure of 1000 kg/punch (1 ton) (see pages 66-68). As a matter of facts, experiments 3 and 4 show that the produced tablet that can maintain the functions of a compressed tablet is at a tabletting pressure of 500 kg/punch, which is 0.5 ton. This tabletting pressure is outside of the range recited in the claims, namely, from 0.7-1.3 ton.

Consequently, a burdensome amount of research would be required by one of ordinary skill in the art to make and/or use the claimed method to prepare tablet with adequate hardness, and maintaining a function of a compressed tablet at tabletting pressure recited in the claims.

As such, the practitioner would turn to trial and error experimentation in order to use the claimed method without guidance from the specification or the prior art.

The relative skill of those in the art: the skill of one of ordinary skill in the art is very high, e.g., Ph.D. and M.D. level technology.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The 103(a) rejections of record have been withdrawn in view of applicant's Remarks.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 05/18/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's arguments with respect to the 112, first paragraph rejection is not persuasive for the following reasons:

- a) there is no showing in the specification that at the claimed tablet pressure, the film on the granule or the base matrix is destroyed (as recited in the claims), but the sustained release properties is maintained; however, contrary to the claims
- b) it is evident from the present specification that the tablet pressure recited in the claimed method does not destroy or damage the film on the granule or the base matrix (page 16, lines 1-6; and page 18, last paragraph through page 19).

Accordingly, a burdensome amount of research would be required by one of ordinary skill in the art to make a tablet having a sustained/controlled release properties using the claimed method that requires the coating film to be destroyed. This is because the present specification discloses that the tablet ca be produced without breading the film coating (page 18, last paragraph).

As such, the practitioner would turn to trial and error experimentation in order to use the claimed method without guidance from the specification or the prior art.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Application/Control Number: 09/647,777 Page 6

Art Unit: 1615

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to S. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-0606. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward can be reached on (571) 272-8373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 09/647,777 Page 7

Art Unit: 1615

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. Tran/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1615